

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 10, 2000 LB 1021

Number one, it assumes that over that amount is inappropriate and we can't invent a rationale that would justify it, and (laugh) consequently, below it, it is appropriate. And appropriateness is not measured by the amount. Appropriateness is measured by the intent or whether there is a tit for tat exchange, that's where the inappropriateness should be prosecuted. And short of that, if it is appropriate, then let the public decide through disclosure, not the Accountability and Disclosure Commission through penalties and fines. But we should be above the appearance of influence. That standard is too amorphous, too difficult and cannot be reached. It means the person who has the suspicion gets to determine what the standard or the barrier is, and it can rise or fall, actually it will just keep rising. As people get more and more cynical, the bar gets higher and higher as to what is in fact inappropriate. The way to deal with that is to say here is your officeholder, it's election time, they've got a candidate running against them, they've got a willing press to cover their behaviors, and they've got a pot full of information down at the Accountability and Disclosure Commission on money that's been spent as gifts or money spent as contributions or their personal holdings or whatever, and the public will decide. These standards are not the way that we should create...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...a belief that we're going to (laugh) inspire faith. These don't inspire faith. This doesn't do anything for the public's reaction to the Legislature; disclosure does and catching wrongdoers does. It doesn't lie in the creating of artificial standards and applying them in these kinds of ways. Nobody says, when you go out on the campaigns, thank God you've got that new \$500 maximum on gifts. What they say is, what about your campaign contributions? Are you taking PAC money? What kind of PAC money you taking? They might ask about that, and totally legitimate. But disclosure is the tool, that is the tool to use, not maximum standard amounts, these kinds of things. I wish I'd gotten back up here a little quicker so I could have added my red vote to the eight no votes on the last one, because I think that was a mistake. We should trust disclosure rather than these standards. And then we should trust prosecutions...